

From: [Patricia Butler](#)
To: [Waage, Melissa](#)
Subject: 073014 Clean Water Protection Rule Media Report - 9 items including more from AFBF ...
Date: Wednesday, July 30, 2014 10:09:39 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)



July 30, 2014

News Coverage

No new stories today.

Opinion

The Ag Agenda, Roundup Web/Sidney, MT, (op-ed), 07/30/14. Bob Stallman: Two Supreme Court rulings have limited EPA's and the Corps of Engineers' authority under the Clean Water Act to waters that are navigable or have a "significant nexus" to navigable waters. EPA claims the rulings "complicated" the permitting process. EPA has said that it only wants to bring "clarity and consistency" to the process. That sounds reasonable. Good talking point. The only problem is the statement does not reflect what is in the proposed rule. The regulation will automatically regulate countless small and remote so-called "waters" that are usually dry and, in fact, look like land to you and me. This is far more than a "clarification." It is a dramatic expansion of federal power. Expanding the federal government's jurisdiction under the guise of bringing clarity and consistency to the process is the opposite of straight talk. Bob Stallman is president of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Grain farmers also at risk, The (Jefferson City, MO) News Tribune, (letter to the editor), 07/29/14. Kristie Scheulen: We are all at risk from the EPA's over reach. The Clean Water Act was created to address chemical runoff from many different sources and it has served its purpose well but now the EPA wants to expand its definition of navigable waters to include "waters of the United States." Ditches, creeks and farm ponds could soon be under the jurisdiction of the EPA. Kristie Scheulen lives in Loose Creek, Mo.

EPA's "Waters of the U.S." Proposal: Coming Soon to a Back Yard Near You?, Washington Legal Foundation, (op-ed), 07/29/14. Scott McFadin: On April 21, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the United States Army Corps of Engineers issued proposed regulations that would increase their regulatory jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act (CWA). The Act gives EPA authority to regulate "waters of the United States." Over the past two decades, federal courts have (pardon the pun) muddled the waters on agencies' authority. Despite the widespread and costly impact EPA's proposed "waters" definition could have on private land, the agency has utterly failed to provide the public with an accurate assessment of the costs associated with the proposed definition. Scott McFadin, is a 2014 Judge K.K. Legett Fellow at the Washington Legal Foundation and a student at Texas Tech School of Law.

Blogs/Social Media



Pacific Standard @PacificStand. 11h

Why can't the EPA enforce the **Clean Water Act**? The government can't agree on what's considered water: psmag.com/navigation/nat...



Rose @wiggged 12h

I contacted my Democrat Rep for voting with Republicans against **Clean water act**. I used language he won't wonder, what I meant!!



Rose @wiggged 13h

List of Democrats who voted with republicans against **clean water act** . Contact you rep and tell them NO WAY ! m.dailykos.com/story/2014/07/...



Environmental Law @Energy_Alerts 16h

New Definition of Waters Protected Under the **Clean Water Act** Proposed bit.ly/1nyzPOI



Todd Neeley @toddneeleyDTN 20h

EPA has yet to schedule a public hearing on the **Clean Water Act** rule, anywhere in the Corn Belt and/or Prairie Pothole region.



PLANET @PLANET2005 23h

Could you really need a **Clean Water Act** permit to plant a tree? Stop the WOTUS rule. landscapeadvocacy.ow.ly/zpqlA...